

February 26, 2010

Submission of the United States of America

Organization of Work of the AWG/LCA in 2010

- The United States is committed to achieving the full and effective implementation of the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change. In this context, we are pleased to provide our preliminary views on organization of work for 2010.
- The United States recalls the historic nature of the Fifteenth Conference of the Parties in Copenhagen. Heads of State representing Parties with the overwhelming majority of global greenhouse gas emissions, together with leaders and heads of delegation representing a significant portion of the world's vulnerable countries, personally engaged in intensive negotiations over two days, forging a consensus package among them that addresses the most fundamental issues on the table in the run-up to Copenhagen.
- The resulting Copenhagen Accord achieves a number of landmark outcomes that substantially advance the implementation of the Convention and provide a basis for an agreed outcome in Mexico:
 - First, it establishes the first globally-agreed quantitative parameter for the ultimate objective of the Framework Convention, namely that the increase in global average temperature should stay below 2°C compared to pre-industrial levels. This goal represents a significant advance in global consensus about the collective level of ambition that Parties should strive to achieve. The Accord provides for review of the goal and efforts to meet it in light of our evolving understanding of the science.
 - Second, the Copenhagen Accord provides for both Annex I and non-Annex I Parties to set out, ex ante, their respective mitigation targets/actions and to implement them. In submissions to the UNFCCC up to January 31, Parties constituting over 80% of global greenhouse gas emissions have inscribed actions that reflect a marked increase in ambition from levels in place before Copenhagen.
 - Third, the Copenhagen Accord makes important progress on transparency by reflecting agreement, among other things, that the implementation of domestically supported mitigation actions will be subject to domestic measurement, reporting and verification with provisions for international consultations and analysis. Guidelines to implement the transparency provisions will give Parties confidence that others are carrying out their promises and that the world is on track to meet the environmental objective of the Convention.
 - Fourth, the Copenhagen Accord calls for enhanced action to assist developing countries that are vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change.

- Fifth, the Copenhagen Accord includes important financing provisions for developing countries as part of an overall package: for prompt start financing approaching \$30 billion over the next three years; for a goal, in the context of meaningful mitigation action and transparency in implementation, of jointly mobilizing \$100 billion a year by 2020 from public and private sources; for the establishment of a new global fund; and for creation of a High Level Panel to study different potential sources of revenue regarding the \$100 billion goal.
- Sixth, the Accord calls for the establishment of mechanisms for REDD plus and for Technology.
- The United States was disappointed that a handful of Parties succeeded in blocking adoption of the Copenhagen Accord by the Conference of the Parties, but notes that very broad support was expressed for the Accord during the final plenary session by representatives speaking on behalf of both country blocs and individual Parties.
- Those involved in the development of the Accord negotiated in good faith with the intention that it result in an agreed outcome in Copenhagen, and understood it to be a package – one that, like all difficult compromises, is ideal to no Party, but which was acceptable to a diverse range of Parties.
- The Copenhagen Accord is expressly operational and calls for work to be carried out in a number of areas that should be launched without delay. At the same time, we would welcome a further formalization of the Accord in Mexico. The balanced package the Parties have before them presents a substantial and perhaps unique opportunity to secure a transparent, effective, and global approach for mitigating and adapting to climate change, including the means to support developing countries in their efforts.

Work in 2010

- Accordingly, the United States considers that an agreed outcome in Mexico should reflect the progress achieved in Copenhagen, and should advance key elements that Parties identified for further work.
- These include the following:
 - Mitigation: The understandings reached in the Copenhagen Accord reflected intensive discussions at the Head of State level by the Parties involved in its discussions. A Mexico outcome will need to reflect the balanced outcomes pertaining to mitigation in the Copenhagen Accord, and should include the inscriptions of Annex I and non-Annex I Parties.
 - Transparency: An outcome in Mexico should also include new guidelines for national communications under Article 12 to enable more frequent GHG inventories, to provide for enhanced reporting, measuring and verification, and to

guide international consultation and analysis, consistent with paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Copenhagen Accord.

- Goal/Review: A Mexico outcome should reflect understandings that Parties achieved with respect to a long-term temperature goal and a 2015 review of the actions of Parties in light of evolving science.
 - REDD-Plus: Parties were close to finalizing a decision text that would provide the initial outlines of a REDD+ mechanism, with particular focus to readiness activities and safeguards. Work should continue on the decision text, including further elaboration of a future mechanism, for adoption in Mexico.
 - Adaptation: A Mexico outcome should include measures to address the adaptation challenges faced by all countries and further elaborate actions under the Convention to address adaptation to the adverse impacts of climate change in developing countries, especially those that are particularly vulnerable.
 - Finance: Participants in the Copenhagen Accord agreed on a Copenhagen Green Climate Fund to be established as an operating entity of the financial mechanism. Work to elaborate the CGCF should be moved forward quickly in the context of broad elaboration of the Accord, and if ready, the COP in Mexico could endorse the Fund as an operating entity and provide any further guidance, in accordance with Article 11.1 and other relevant provisions of the Convention.
 - Technology: Participants in the Copenhagen Accord decided to establish a mechanism on technology, and we support a new mechanism that will have real and tangible benefits in accelerating the deployment of technologies in developing countries, including through a climate technology center and network of experts and practitioners. We believe we can build on the positive discussions in the LCA in Copenhagen to determine the most effective means of achieving this.
- The United States notes that LCA texts have been vehicles for facilitating consensus on key issues, and their contents do not reflect specific agreements or understandings in the negotiating process. And, significantly, it was not agreed that the LCA texts would be the basis of any future negotiation. As such, we are of the view that Parties will need to consider which texts are still relevant in the first session of the LCA in light of circumstances in Copenhagen.
 - In some cases, such as the text on REDD-plus, LCA facilitator texts reflect an emerging consensus among a diverse group of Parties. Other texts have not benefited from discussion and do not reflect emerging consensus. In still other cases, such as those relating to mitigation and shared vision, the outcomes in Copenhagen overlap substantially with outcomes in the Copenhagen Accord, and the United States is of the view that it will be difficult to find consensus around alternative proposals that depart from the Accord understandings.

The United States considers that it would be valuable to address the intended legal character of the agreed outcome earlier rather than later. The United States supports a legally binding outcome in Mexico provided that the legally binding elements in an otherwise acceptable agreement would apply in a symmetrical manner to all major economies.

- Organization of Work: The United States believes that countries should improve the efficiency of the negotiating process going forward while ensuring transparency. A key lesson of 2009 is that significant negotiating time is less important in reaching agreement than providing adequate time for countries to consult with each other bilaterally and regionally.
- To improve the efficiency of the process and improve coherence between related issues, we suggest that the LCA Chair significantly reduce the number of discrete groups handling negotiating issues.
- Serious consideration should be given to a longer High Level Segment than we have had to date at COP-16, so that ministers can fully engage on what will no doubt be a complex agenda in Mexico.